



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/715,576	11/17/2000	Hua-Shuang Kong	5000.89A	5716
21176	7590	08/29/2005	EXAMINER	
SUMMA & ALLAN, P.A. 11610 NORTH COMMUNITY HOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 CHARLOTTE, NC 28277			KACKAR, RAM N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1763	

DATE MAILED: 08/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

HC

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/715,576

4D
Applicant(s)

KONG ET AL.

Examiner

Ram N. Kackar

Art Unit

1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22, 24, 49 and 50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22, 24, 49 and 50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 22, 24 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Thomas F Briody (US 3659552).

Thomas F Briody discloses a reactor vessel of quartz (Fig 1-13 and Col 2 lines 38-41) which would make it transparent to electromagnetic radiation, having a gas supply system (29), induction coils as a source of electromagnetic radiation (41), being barrel type (Fig 1), thermally responsive, hollow inverted type of susceptor (15) made of thermally responsive graphite (Col 1 lines 42-54), defined by a plurality of planer surfaces (Fig 2 and 3-18) connected at adjacent sides, spaced optimally to allow flow of reactive gases without obstruction as well as allow them to heat each other (Fig 1), and plurality of pockets to receive substrates (Fig 1).

Regarding heating the substrate to substantially same temperature from the pocket side or from the facing side, this is a functional limitation. However since the structure of the apparatus is precisely as claimed the heating response would obviously be same.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas F Briody (US 3659552) in view of Martin et al (US 4579080).

Thomas F Briody discloses a reactor vessel containing thermally responsive graphite (Col 1 lines 42-54) but does not disclose graphite coated with silicon carbide.

It is well known that graphite is coated with silicon carbide to prevent migration of carbon in to silicon substrate.

Martin et al disclose a reactor vessel containing susceptor made of a thermally responsive material, graphite, coated with silicon carbide (Col 7 line 60) heated by induction coils as a source of electromagnetic radiation.

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to coat graphite susceptor of Thomas F Briody by silicon carbide in order to prevent migration of carbon.

Art Unit: 1763

Response to Amendment

Applicants amendment filed 5/2/2005 have been considered but the arguments are not persuasive.

Applicant has basically repeated the arguments.

Applicant argues that Briody shows a round, one piece unit and a susceptor of rings but fails to show adjacent side wall sections with planer surfaces as claimed, since portions other than the recessed portions are curved.

Examiners position is that Briody discloses plurality of planer surface sections to hold planer substrates in intimate contact, connected at adjacent sides as required by the claims. Being carved out of a ring does not impart patentability since the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.” *In re Thorpe*, 777

F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Further, the rejections are in accord with MPEP 2111, which states that during patent examination the pending claim must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.

Regarding applicants arguments related to the disclosure in Briody of temperature gradient, it has been held that claims directed to apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. *In re Danley*, 120 USPQ 528, 531, (CCPQ 1959); “Apparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device does” (Emphasis in original) *Hewlett-Packard Co. V. Bausch & Lomb Inc.*, 15USPQ2d 1525, 1 528 (Fed. Cir. 1990); and a claim

Art Unit: 1763

containing a (recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987). Also see MPEP 2114.

Applicant's arguments regarding the presence of quartz plates in the presence of transitional phrase "Consisting Essentially Of" are considered. However they are not persuasive since quartz plates are parts of claimed transparent enclosure around the susceptor.

Applicant further argues against the combination of Briody and Martin et al as applied to claim 50 and argue that these references teach against each other.

This is not correct. The combination of Briody and Martin et al passes three pronged test laid out in *Graham v. Deere* 148 USPQ 259, 467 (USSC 1966). Only differences between the prior art of Briody and claim 50 is the coating of silicon carbide on the disclosed graphite in Briody. Martin et al teach a very similar apparatus with a teaching of the coating of silicon carbide on graphite. Applicants themselves disclose that prior art susceptors were formed of graphite coated by silicon carbide (Specification page 4 line 30).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 1763

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ram N Kackar whose telephone number is 571 272 1436. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 A.M to 5:P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on 571 272 1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Ram Kackar AU 1763